

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed March 30, 2007 has been carefully considered. Within the Office Action Claims 28-61 have been rejected. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Judicially-created Double Patenting

Claims 28-61 were rejected pursuant to the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-28 of prior United States patent No. 6,707,443. The Applicant respectfully traverses. However, to expedite prosecution of the present application, a Terminal Disclaimer is hereby submitted which overcomes the double patenting rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

It is believed that this reply places the above-identified patent application into condition for allowance. Early favorable consideration of this reply is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Please charge any additional required fee or credit any overpayment not otherwise paid or
credited to our deposit account No. 50-1698.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6/21/07



Suvashis Bhattacharya
Reg. No. 46,554

Thelen Reid Brown Raysman & Steiner LLP
P.O. Box 640640
San Jose, CA 95164-0640
Tel. (408) 292-5800
Fax. (408) 287-8040